

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Official Action dated December 23, 2010 which rejected all of currently pending claims 1-32. To better point out and claim their invention, applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 11, 12, 20, and 32. Ample antecedent basis exists in the specification and drawings for such amendments so applicants have added no new matter.

Applicants express their thanks to the examiner for withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the applicants' previous remarks.

Objection to the Drawings

The examiner has objected to applicants' drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims. In particular, the examiner contends that applicants' drawings fail to show applicants' recited claim feature of "adding noise to at least one pixel in a picture in the video stream following the decoding of the video stream in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture". Applicants respectively take issue with this rejection.

Applicants' FIGS 1-3 each depict a noise generator (16, 16') which generates noise supplied to one input of a summing block (18) having a second input supplied with at least one of a decoded picture and a reference picture. The examiner can surely appreciate that a digital picture comprises a plurality of pixels. Thus, the noise from the noise generator (16, 16') gets added to at least one pixel of a picture following decoding.

Applicants' specification fully discloses that their noise generator adds correlated noise to the picture following decoding. To that end, applicants' direct the examiner's attention to page 3, lines 30-32 and page 4, lines 1-21 of applicants' specification which describes how the noise generator (16) of FIG. 1 generator generates adds noise to at least one pixel in a picture in the video stream following the decoding of the video stream in an amount correlated to additive noise of pixels in at least one prior picture.

Given the explicit depiction in FIGS. 1-3 of a noise generator generating noise for addition to a decoded picture, as well as the discussion in applicants' specification of the noise

generator adding correlated noise, the drawings show all of the features of applicants' claims. Therefore, applicants request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

If the examiner has specific legends which he believes should be added to applicants' drawings, applicants ask that the examiner communicate such information for applicants' consideration.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection of Claim 11

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The examiner contends that claim 11 recites "adding noise to...at least one other picture" whereas applicants' specification only provides support for adding noise to...at least one *prior* picture." Applicants have now amended claim 11 to recite the feature of adding noise to...at least one prior picture". In view of the amendments to claim 11, applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claim 11.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection of Claims 1-32

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to distinctly point out and claim applicants' invention. In particular, the examiner points out that line 3 of applicants' claim 1 recites "decoding the video stream" whereas lines 4-5 recite "following decoding". In this regard, the examiner contends that it is unclear that the decoding in line 3 of claim refers to the same decoding operation in lines 4-5 of that claim.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to now recite "following the decoding of the video stream" in lines 4-5 of claim 1 to make clear that such decoding refers explicitly to the decoding recited in line 3 of the same claim. Applicants have made similar amendments to claims 7, 11, 12, 20, and 32. Claim 28, as written, already recites this feature. The amendments to claims 1, 7, 11, 20, and 32 render these claims, and the claims dependent therefrom fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 1-32.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. However, if there is a fee, please charge the fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Jill MacDonald Boyce

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy, Attorney
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312